

## Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/605,154

First Named Applicant: Wiss

Examiner: Pham, Khanh B

Art Unit: 2166

Status: Pending

**Tentative Participants:**

(1) John A. Smart

(2) Derek G. Reiger

(3)

(4)

Proposed Date of Interview: TBD

Proposed Time of Interview: TBD

**Type of Interview Requested:**(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video ConferenceExhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, provide brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

### Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) 102	1-8, 10-23, 25-32, and 34-43	Kolovson	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) 103	9, 24 and 33	Kolovson & Riedel	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3)			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4)			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☒ Continuation Sheet Attached☐ Proposed Amendment or Arguments AttachedBrief Description of Arguments to be Presented: See attached.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on \_\_\_\_\_.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

\_\_\_\_\_  
/John A. Smart/

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner/SPE Signature\_\_\_\_\_  
John A. Smart

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

\_\_\_\_\_  
34929

Registration Number, if applicable

\_\_\_\_\_  
December 1, 2010

Date Request Submitted

**CONTINUATION SHEET**  
**FOR APPLICANT INITIATED INTERVIEW REQUEST**

Proposed Interview date: TBD (per Examiner's availability)

Proposed Interview time: TBD (per Examiner's availability)

I. Overview of invention, with brief discussion of the problems presented in prior art systems and how the present invention alleviates these problems

II. Discussion of the cited references

A. Kolovson

B. Kolovson & Riedel

III. Review claims and limitations that distinguish the invention over the cited art, including for example

A. Applicant's replicate or standby node remains "live" during system operation, in direct contrast to Kolovson.

B. Kolovson indicates that his primary and standby nodes share the same data, that is, there is only one real copy of the data itself (i.e., a single data store). Kolovson requires an "activation" step during fail-over to bring a new data store on-line -- an approach expressly eschewed by Applicant's claimed invention.

C. Riedel does not address above deficiencies of Kolovson.

IV. Discussion of outstanding issues and wrap-up